REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-12 and 14-28. Claims 1, 12 and 23-28 are amended herein. No new matter is presented. Claims 2 and 13 remain cancelled.

Thus, claims 1, 3-12 and 14-28 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

INTERVIEW WITH EXAMINER:

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for taking the time to conduct an Examiner Interview on November 30, 2006.

During the Examiner interview, U.S. Patent No. 6,047,260 (Levinson) and U.S. Patent No. 5,519,606 (Frid) were discussed. In particular, Applicants pointed out that both Levinson and Frid handle overlap of schedules identically and require the user's input regarding handling of the overlap. In contrast, the claimed invention enables application of different conditions to overlapped schedules without requiring the user to identify a condition to be applied to the overlapped schedules (see discussion of claims below). Independent claims are hereby amended to clarify these features.

Applicants also respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned if any of the features recited in the claims are unclear, or any further clarification is needed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112¶2:

Claims 1, 3-12 and 14-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112¶2 as being indefinite. Claims 1, 12 and 23-28 are amended herein to comply with requirements of § 112¶2 (claims 3-10 and 14-22 are dependent from the amended claims).

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1, 3-12 and 14-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of the following: Levinson, Frid and Windows 95™ Manual (Marks).

The Examiner maintains the comparison of Levinson that prompts a user to respond to corrections to a current plan and adjusts the current plan based on responses from the user with the claimed invention. However, when plan corrections are needed in Levinson, the system adjusts the plan by permitting the user to override goals or cues at any time (see, col. 4, lines 17-

9

31). As such, the Levinson system is directed to handling or treating all corrections and adjustments to events in the plan in an identical manner.

On page 11 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Frid provides an option for reconciling conflict of schedules by inputting preferences or for maintaining the overlap of the schedules. However, similar to Levinson, Frid handles all schedules that have common intervals in the same manner and requires a user's input for reconciling or not reconciling the schedules. As shown in Fig. 3E of Frid, when the user selects the 10:00 a.m. event, since an event is already scheduled in this timeslot, the system generates a duplicate 10:00 a.m. field such that the user reconciles events which not only overlap in duration but also conflict as to start time, or the user may specify that an event cannot overlap with other events and therefore will not be reconciled (see, col. 5, lines 52-64).

The Examiner relies on Marks as teaching storing a history of deleted schedules upon deleting or adjusting schedules and referring to the same for recovery. Marks merely addresses maintenance of a folder until the user confirms intent to remove the files selecting and deleting the files (see, page 1, paragraph 4).

In contrast, the claimed invention "selectively" handles an overlap of schedules using "different conditions" based on whether the overlapped schedules are classified as "the period type and the period type" or "the period type and the term type."

Independent claim 1, by way of example, recites, "a schedule adjusting unit which . selectively adjusts the schedules using different conditions in accordance with a combination of overlapped schedule types classified as the period type and the period type or the period type and the term type." As such, in a case where said inputted schedule overlaps with an existing schedule with respect to the time, the claimed apparatus "maintains overlapped term type schedules based on classification and adjusts all other overlapped schedule types without requiring an input from a user to indicate adjustment of said other overlapped schedule types." Claims 12, 23 and 24 recite similar features.

Independent claim 25 recites, "adjusting schedules according to said classifying of the types", where "each of the overlapped schedules are classified into the types and overlapped schedules having a predetermined type are maintained and all other overlapped schedules are adjusted without requiring an input from a user to indicate adjustment of said other overlapped schedules."

10

Similarly, claims 26 and 27 respectively recite, "selectively adjusting the overlapped schedules, without requiring an input from a user indicating adjustment of said overlapped schedules" and "selectively adjusting the overlap in accordance with the classification of each of the schedules without requiring an input from a user to indicate adjustment of the schedules resulting in the overlap."

Independent claim 28 also recites, "selectively adjusting overlapping schedules based on said determining" by applying "a first condition to overlapped schedules with identical designated period of completion" and "a second condition to maintain overlapped schedules with identical designated date/time unchanged, without requiring a user to indicate application of said first condition and said second condition."

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "selective adjustment" of schedules using "different conditions" based on classification of the schedules and "without requiring a user to indicate" how the different types of schedules should be handled (see above discussion of each independent claim).

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over the cited references.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. Dependent claim 6, for example, recites "where the inputted new schedule and the existing schedule are the period type schedules and periods of both of said schedules overlap, said schedule adjusting unit adjusts the schedules so as to leave the schedule of high priority" (see also claim 17 that recites similar features).

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest selective adjustment of schedules including adjusting "so as to leave the schedule of high priority", as recited in claims 6 and 17.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12/19/2006

By: _Temnit Afework_
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501